

## LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 16th October, 1984

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/6947.— In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Paul Engineers, Modern Industrial Area, Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
ROHTAK

Reference No. 242 of 78

between

SHRI MOHAN PARSHAD, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S PAUL  
ENGINEERS, MODERN INDUSTRIAL AREA, BAHADURGARH

Present :

Workman in person.

Shri M. M. Kaushal, A. R., for the management.

## AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Mohan Parshad, and the management of M/s Paul Engineers, Modern Industrial Area, Bahadurgarh, to this Court, for adjudication,—vide Labour Department Gazette Notification No. II/ SPT/98-78/39007, dated 28th August, 1978 :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Mohan Parshad was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, usual notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workman alleged that he was employed as helper by the management on monthly wages of Rs 175 but his services were terminated illegally on 27th June, 1978 in flagrant disregard of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947.

3. A detailed reply was filed by the respondent, controverting the claim of the petitioner. Since this reference is being decided on grounds other than merits, so I need not detail the pleas taken by the respondent.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were laid down for decision on 18th January, 1979 :—

(1) Whether the termination of services of the workman was justified and in order ?

(2) If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

5. After the parties has gone through the gamut of evidence, the workman settled his claim with the management. Thereunder his statement has been recorded. So, no dispute survives for adjudication. This reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to costs.

Dated the 31st August, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 242-78/3142, dated 24th September, 1984

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak,